

Process ID	
Title	PDG Community Innovation Grant
Evaluator #	
Proposer	

### Instructions

Please enter in your assigned evaluator number in cell B3 and the proposer you're evaluating in cell B4. This will populate the same cells on the remaining tabs.

In tabs Section 1 - Section 6 please review the questions/sections being evaluated (beginning in cell A6) as well as the benchmarks set for evaluating the proposal. Once you've determined the score you will be awarding for each tab, please enter your score in cell R6.

In the Bonus Points tab please review the additional considerations and answer Yes or No in the drop down lists in cells N13 - N16. Points will be automatically calculated based on yes or no response.

Process ID [Redacted]  
 Title PDG Community Innovation Grant  
 Evaluator # [Redacted]  
 Proposer [Redacted]

Evaluator Score [Redacted]

Section 1. Proposer Response to Identification of Community Need; (20 Points)	
Utilize data to describe the needs in their community. Data should include a focus on families with children ages 0 to 5 years and any priority populations that the plan will serve. Priority populations may include families of color, multilingual families, low-income families and other families experiencing challenges (e.g. homeless, child welfare connected, children with disabilities), as well as Tribal families;	
Rating Scale Point Breakdown	
Exceeds Expectations: <b>16-20</b>	Minimally Meets Expectations: <b>5-9</b>
Meets Expectations: <b>10-15</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations: <b>1-4</b>
Benchmarks	
<u>Exceeds Expectations:</u> Plan clearly articulates the issue and the extent of the need  Uses local, recent and unbiased data to inform their assessment of the problem/need Data specifically shows the need to families with children ages B-5 Data specifically shows the needs of specific priority populations	<u>Meets Expectations:</u> Provides information regarding the issue and extent of the need but some information is unclear  Uses local data to somewhat inform their assessment of the problem/need Data includes families with children ages B-5 Data includes priority populations
<u>Minimally Meets Expectations:</u> Describes the issue, but does not detail the extent of the need Uses anecdotal information to support the need Data includes families with children ages B-5 Prioritized populations are mentioned but data is not clear or specific to the populations	<u>Does Not Meet Expectations:</u> Plan to address the problem or need is unclear and/or didn't provide a complete response Plan does not provide data to inform the need for the work Plan does not include data for children ages B-5 or prioritizes an older population

Process ID [Redacted]  
 Title PDG Community Innovation Grant  
 Evaluator # [Redacted]  
 Proposer [Redacted]

Evaluator Score [Redacted]

Section 2 Proposer Response to Parent and Stakeholder Engagement (20 Points)	
A. Plan includes a description of how parents and caregivers will be engaged, including how their plan prioritizes and partners with families of color, multilingual families, low-income families and other families experiencing challenges (e.g. homeless, child welfare connected, children with disabilities), as well as collaboration with Tribes	
Rating Scale Point Breakdown	
Exceeds Expectations: <b>16-20</b>	Minimally Meets Expectations: <b>5-9</b>
Meets Expectations: <b>10-15</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations: <b>1-4</b>
Benchmarks	
<u>Exceeds Expectations:</u> Plan uses an equity-centered approach that is well thought out Plan includes authentic parent and caregiver engagement that informs the need but also provides ongoing feedback Plan provides specific detail to prioritize and partner with families of color, multilingual families, low-income families and other families experiencing challenges (e.g. homeless, child welfare connected, children with disabilities), as well as collaboration with Tribes that leverages the greatest impact possible	<u>Meets Expectations:</u> Plan uses an equity-centered approach that is well thought out Plan includes authentic parent and caregiver engagement but evaluator has some question about the process Plan prioritize and partners with families of color, multilingual families, low-income families and other families experiencing challenges (e.g. homeless, child welfare connected, children with disabilities), as well as collaboration with Tribes but evaluator has question about prioritization or partnership
<u>Minimally Meets Expectations:</u> Uses an equity-centered approach Includes parent and caregiver engagement Plan addresss partnerships with families of color, multilingual families, low-income families and other families experiencing challenges (e.g. homeless, child welfare connected, children with disabilities), as well as collaboration with Tribes	<u>Does Not Meet Expectations:</u> Does not use an equity-centered approach Does not include parent and stake holder engagement Does not prioritize or address partnering with families of color, multilingual families, low-income families and other families experiencing challenges (e.g. homeless, child welfare connected, children with disabilities), as well as collaboration with Tribes

Process ID [Redacted]  
 Title PDG Community Innovation Grant  
 Evaluator # [Redacted]  
 Proposer [Redacted]

Evaluator Score [Redacted]

<b>Section 3 Proposer Response to Connections of Wisconsin's Strategic Plan (20 Points)</b>	
A. How their plan will address at least two of the four areas of WI's SP -- access, affordability, quality, and the workforce.	
<b>Rating Scale Point Breakdown</b>	
Exceeds Expectations: <b>16-20</b>	Minimally Meets Expectations: <b>5-9</b>
Meets Expectations: <b>10-15</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations: <b>1-4</b>
<b>Benchmarks</b>	
<u>Exceeds Expectations:</u> Clearly articulates a plan that is connected to more than 2 areas of the SP References specific objectives or strategies located within the SP in their response	<u>Meets Expectations:</u> Clearly articulates a plan that is connected to 2 areas of the SP References the SP
<u>Minimally Meets Expectations:</u> Plan addresses 2 of the 4 areas of the SP but some information is unclear	<u>Does Not Meet Expectations:</u> Addresses less than 2 of the four areas of the SP

Process ID [Redacted]  
 Title PDG Community Innovation Grant  
 Evaluator # [Redacted]  
 Proposer [Redacted]

Evaluator Score [Redacted]

**Section 4 Proposer Response to Major Activities including SMARTIE objectives (40 points)**

A. Plan will meet their community needs with a detailed plan of major activities including SMARTIE (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Scaled, Inclusive, Equitable) objectives and deliverables.

- Specific and Measurable: Define how many families and children will be served; identify any specific populations that will be served; the impact on the children and families served; how many partners will be engaged; and number of services connected to families.
- Achievable: Describe why you believe you can achieve each activity (consider your past experience, your relationships, other strengths and resources you bring to the implementation of the activity, etc.)
- Relevant: All grantees will be chosen based on identified local needs and how plans address those needs; connection to access, affordability, quality, and workforce.
- Time-Scaled: Detail how you will accomplish the activity in 10 months and a plan for how it will be sustained beyond the grant period.
- Inclusive and Equitable: Describe how services will be targeted towards Tribal families, families of color, multilingual families, families experiencing homelessness, families connected to the child welfare system, and/or families with children with disabilities; and how these families will advise your work so programs and services respect both the cultures and languages of your community.

Rating Scale Point Breakdown	
Exceeds Expectations: <b>30-40</b>	Minimally Meets Expectations: <b>10-19</b>
Meets Expectations: <b>20-29</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations: <b>1-9</b>

Benchmarks	
<u>Exceeds Expectations:</u> All information requested is provided in a way that demonstrates an understanding of the scope and purpose of the grant. The objectives and activities are clearly stated, realistic, measurable, and consistent with the grant requirements. The indicators identified are likely to measure the desired outcome.	<u>Meets Expectations:</u> Most of the information requested is provided in a way that demonstrates an understanding of the scope and purpose of the grant. The objectives and activities are stated, fairly realistic, measurable, and consistent with the grant requirements. The evaluator has some questions. The indicators identified are likely to measure the outcome desired.
<u>Minimally Meets Expectations:</u> The information provided demonstrates a partial understanding of the scope and purpose of the grant. The objectives and activities are not fully clear, realistic or measurable. There are some inconsistencies with the grant requirements. Some of the indicators identified are unlikely to measure the outcome desired.	<u>Does Not Meet Expectations:</u> The information provided does not demonstrate an understanding of the scope and the purpose of the grant. The objectives and activities are not clearly stated, realistic, measurable, or consistent with the grant requirements. The indicators identified will not measure the outcomes desired.

Process ID [Redacted]  
 Title PDG Community Innovation Grant  
 Evaluator # [Redacted]  
 Proposer [Redacted]

Evaluator Score [Redacted]

Section 5 Proposer Response to Collaboration with cross-sector, public and private partnerships (20 Points)	
Plan identifies a lead and a co-lead representing two different organizations. Describe how the plan will collaborate across industries and services (e.g. ECE, K-12, health, mental health, workforce development, transportation, child welfare, the business community, etc.); defines the roles and responsibilities of partners within the collaboration.	
Rating Scale Point Breakdown	
Exceeds Expectations: <b>15-20</b>	Minimally Meets Expectations: <b>5-9</b>
Meets Expectations: <b>10-14</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations: <b>1-4</b>
Benchmarks	
<u>Exceeds Expectations:</u> Clearly articulates the structure of the partnership including roles and responsibilities for all partners Plan capitalizes on existing structures to leverage a collective impact Clearly defines a lead and co-lead representing two organizations Plan clearly describes multiple industries and /or services represented in the collaboration	<u>Meets Expectations:</u> Clearly articulates the structure of the partnership including roles and responsibilities for at least the lead and co-lead partners but evaluator has a few questions about other partners Clearly defines a lead and co-lead representing two organizations Plan mentions some different industries and/or services represented in the collaboration
<u>Minimally Meets Expectations:</u> Antecedotely discusses collaboration across industries, services and/or organizations  Clearly defines a lead and co-lead representing two organizations	<u>Does Not Meet Expectations:</u> Does not clearly address collaboration across different industries, services or organizations  Plan does not identify a lead and co-lead that represent both the public and private sector

Process ID [Redacted]  
 Title PDG Community Innovation Grant  
 Evaluator # [Redacted]  
 Proposer [Redacted]

Evaluator Score [Redacted]

**Section 6 Proposer Response to Budget Narrative (20 Points)**

Describes how funds will be used for greatest impact and not supplant already existing funds. Includes a description of current resources available for the project (across partner organizations) and how the plan will blend and combine public and private funds at the local level. Note: Detailed expenses will be included in the Budget Narrative Form (not scored) and do not need to be included here.

Note: Per the FAQs, Capital expenditures such as land, construction, buildings, vehicles, etc. are not allowed to be purchased with Community Innovation Grant funds. Please see the FAQs for additional details of allowable expenses. These items, however, are not precluded from the activities if non-CIG funds are supporting them.

Rating Scale Point Breakdown	
Exceeds Expectations: <b>15-20</b>	Minimally Meets Expectations: <b>5-9</b>
Meets Expectations: <b>10-14</b>	Does Not Meet Expectations: <b>1-4</b>

**Benchmarks**

Exceeds Expectations:	Meets Expectations:
<p>Thoroughly answers how funds will be used for greatest impact. It is very clear the structure, model, and approach the organization will be using. The plan is reasonable, well-planned, and feasible given the timeline of the initiative.</p> <p>Clear indication of how funds will be braided between public and private partnerships, as well as partner organizations, including the roles and responsibilities of each organization</p> <p>Clearly articulates how funding does not supplant other funding sources            Budget response reflects use of CIG funds for allowable expenses only, per FAQs.</p>	<p>Provides a plan for how funds will be used describing the structure, model and approach but there are a few questions.</p> <p>Indicates how funds will be braided but doesn't clearly address the responsibilities of each agency or partnership and there are a few questions</p> <p>Addresses how funding does not supplant other funding sources            Budget response reflects use of CIG funds for mostly allowable expenses, per FAQs.</p>
Minimally Meets Expectations:	Does Not Meet Expectations:
<p>Provides a plan for how funds will be used describing the structure, model and approach during the timeline, but there are many questions.</p> <p>Anecdotally indicates the plan will use braided funding and will not supplant existing funds but does not provide details</p> <p>Budget response reflects use of CIG funds for some allowable expenses, per FAQs.</p>	<p>There are significant questions about the structure and feasibility of the plan during the timeline permitted.</p> <p>Braided funding between public and private sources not addressed</p> <p>Budget response reflects CIG funds for mostly unallowable expenses, per FAQs.</p>

Process ID [Redacted]  
 Title PDG Community Innovation Grant  
 Evaluator # [Redacted]  
 Proposer [Redacted]

Evaluator Score [Redacted]

Section 7 Additional Points (20 points)		
Additional consideration will be given to CIG applications that have a clear and intentional focus on the following, detailed within their plan. (5 bonus points per activity listed below)		
1. Prioritization of families with infants and toddlers (Under 3 years old); 2. Implementation or expansion of family navigation; 3. Implementation or expansion of Farm to ECE; and/or 4. Connections to three or more industries:		
Rating Scale Point Breakdown		
5 points per focus included in the narrative section of the plan		
Additional Consideration	Yes or No	Points
1. Do the activities in the proposal have a clear and identified focus on families with infants and toddlers (i.e. at least 50% of the plan or activities is focused on serving this population specifically)		
2. Do the activities in the proposal have a clear and identified focus on implementing or improving a family navigation component (i.e. services to offer guidance and connection to families accessing services for their children)		
3. Do the activities in the proposal have a clear and identified focus on implementing a Farm to ECE program (i.e. connecting farmers and farm fresh foods to child care centers, Head Start programs, 4K/4K Community, etc.)		
4. Are at least three unique industries or services (child care, Birth-3, Home Visiting, transportation, child welfare, local businesses, etc.) listed as partners in the proposal and are the partnerships meaningful to the work that is to be completed?		

Process ID

Title

Evaluator #

Proposer

PDG Community Innovation Grant

Requirement	Possible Points	Points Scored
Section 1	20	
Section 2	20	
Section 3	20	
Section 4	40	
Section 5	20	
Section 6	20	
Bonus Points	20	
Total	<b>160</b>	